

Continuation: Applicant's representatives argued that Table 1 of the original disclosure provides a conclusive showing of unexpected results. Regarding Ueda, the reference teaches a range of values between 90 and 100%- it is the examiner's position that this range includes such a limited number of values that each point is described with "sufficient specificity" and thus, the reference is seen to anticipate the claim with respect to the cis 1,4 content. With respect to Segatta in view of Scrivener (second set of rejections), Scrivener directs one to use a cis 1,4 content between about 96 percent and about 99 percent. In this instance, the disclosed range (of Scrivener) is small and includes an extremely limited number of bond contents. Thus, it is the examiner's position that the plurality of points in Scrivener are disclosed with "sufficient specificity" to render the claims obvious. It is additionally noted that Table 1 can only provide a possible conclusive showing of unexpected results with respect to claim 2 since the independent claim is not commensurate with the inventive examples having the specific rubber loadings.

Applicant's representatives additionally inquired about additional experimentation that might be persuasive. Given the anticipatory nature of Ueda (with respect to the 1,4 bond content), as detailed above, any results would not be effective in overcoming such a rejection. In order to be fully commensurate with claim 1, it was suggested to include experiments having lower amounts of natural rubber. Additionally, applicant was informed that the experiments having 99.6% cis 1,4 bond content (Table 1) were commensurate with the independent claim that requires at least 99.5% cis 1,4 bond content (although not persuasive with respect to the claims).

/Justin R Fischer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791
May 13, 2009